UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,526	04/20/2001	Dietrich Charisius	BOR-006	2147

64107   7590   06/10/2009

KOKKA & BACKUS, PC
200 PAGE MILL ROAD
SUITE 103
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER
MITCHELL, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 March 2009_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-4,7-28,31-65,68-89 and 92-136_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-4,7-28,31-65,68-89 and 92-136_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to an amendment filed on 3/11/09.

Claims 1-4, 7-28, 31-65, 68-89 and 92-136 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new

ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-15, 17-28, 31-32, 34-65, 68-76, 78-89, 92-93 and 95-136 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walton** et al. (USPN

5,883,639) in view of **Chainini** et al. (USPN 5,760,788) in view of **Hedin** ("Supporting

Programming Conventions").

Claim 1

Walton disclosed a method in a data processing system including a computer,

comprising the steps of:

providing the computer with a software development tool having a user interface

that is operable by a user to automatically reflect a modification in the source code to

avoid completely regenerating the source code *(figure 1 and 17; the software*

tool/system and its execution environment), wherein the software development tool

includes computer instructions for performing the following *(column 8, lines 44-65, "The*

interface designer next creates and/or modifies the graphical objects in the drawing and

behavior editor 110 as desired using the available functions of the graphics editor of the

designer's computer system. The resulting objects are then stored as objects in an

object-oriented database system and connected to other objects or user code 120 in

accordance with techniques commonly used in object-oriented systems.") steps:

receiving an identification of a data structure with an attribute field in a database

of data structures useable to form an object-oriented element from the data structure

(figure 1, elements 100 and 110, selected components are data structures with

attributes in a database, 100; column 8, lines 44-65, object-oriented code development);

determining via the computer whether the data structure is associated with

source code *(figure 1, elements 120 and 130, source code developed base on object*

components);

when a determination is made that the data structure is associated with the

source code, another determination is made via the computer as to whether the

attribute field of the data structure is associated with an attribute in the source code

(figure 1, elements 120 and 130, source code developed base on object components;

column 8, lines 58-62);

when an alternative determination is made that the attribute field is not associated with an attribute in the source code, generating via the computer a new attribute in the source code from the attribute field *(figure 1, elements 120 and 130, source code developed base on object components)*; and

receiving user input to modify the source code *(figure 1, elements 120 and 130, source code developed base on object components; column 8, lines 44-65, "The interface designer next creates and/or modifies the graphical objects in the drawing and behavior editor 110 as desired using the available functions of the graphics editor of the designer's computer system. The resulting objects are then stored as objects in an object-oriented database system and connected to other objects or user code 120 in accordance with techniques commonly used in object-oriented systems.")*;

modifying and displaying via the computer a graphical representation of at least a portion of modified source code to reflect the source code modification *(column 9, lines 12-17 "create, delete and manipulate objects ... The resulting graphics images are displayed on a display 330"; column 8, lines 51-62; thus the user manipulating the graphical objects alters the code which is "graphically represented" through the graphical objects)*; and

Walton does not explicitly disclose the modified source code and the graphical representation are displayed simultaneously (although it is noted that Fig. 1 could be understood to represent a single display screen of the VSE system and would then show source, 120 & 130 and graphical code, 110, displayed simultaneously).

Chainini teaches displaying modified source code and corresponding graphical

representations simultaneously (*col. 4, lines 26-34 "simultaneously view both an editor*

for the graphical program and an editor for the text-based programming language. As a

result, changes in the graphical program are immediately reflected in the corresponding

commands or the text-based programming languages and changes in the commands of

the text-based programming language are immediately reflected in the corresponding

graphical program").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to display **Walton's** graphical (*Fig. 1, 110*) and text-based code (*Fig. 1, 120,*

130) simultaneously as taught by **Chainini** (*col. 4, lines 26-34 "simultaneously view*

both"). Those of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so as a known

alternative means of implementing **Walton's** development environment *(col. 7, lines 44-*

47 "A visual software engineering system") which would provide additional flexibility and

ease the knowledge burden of developers while providing learning opportunities

*(**Chainini** col. 3, lines 50-54 "enables a user to design and modify a graphical program,*

and in the process, assists the user in learning to program a computer").

Walton and **Chainini** do not teach using a QA module to evaluate the modified source

code, wherein an error message is generated and displayed if the modified source code

does not conform to a predefined or user-defined style.

Hedin teaches using a QA module to evaluate the modified source code, wherein an

error message is generated and displayed if the modified source code does not conform

to a predefined or user-defined style *(pg. 3, section 3.1, 1st par. "Special error-attributes*

are used to give feedback to the programmer if restrictions are violated").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to include a programming convention tool as taught by **Hedin** *(pg. 2, section*

2, last par. "tools which make both the definition and application of conventions simple

and natural") in the development environment of the **Walton**-**Chainini** combination *(e.g.*

Walton *col. 7, lines 44-47 "A visual software engineering system").* Those of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to do so "to promote "good style", making

code easier to understand and maintain" (***Hedin*** *pg. 2, section 2, par. 5th par.).*

Claim 2

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of: when it is

determined that the data structure is not associated with source code, retrieving a

portion of the data structure; and generating the source code from the portion of the

data structure *(column 8, lines 54-62; figure 1, elements 120 and 130; producing code*

from library/database of components).

Claim 3

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

when it is determined that the data structure is associated with source code,

determining whether a second attribute in the source code is associated with a second

attribute field in the data structure *(figure 1, multiple components; figure 17)*; and

when it is determined that a second attribute in the source code is not associated

with a second attribute field in the data structure, removing the second attribute from the

source code *(column 9, lines 13-15, "delete" components and thus code)*.

Claim 4

Walton disclosed the method of claim 3, wherein the step of removing the second

attribute from the source code comprises the step of removing a method associated

with the second attribute from the source code *(column 9, lines 13-15, "delete"*

components and thus code, including associated methods).

Claim 7

Walton disclosed the method of claim 5, further comprising the step of modifying the

graphical representation of the source code to reflect the removal of the second

attribute *(column 9, lines 13-15, "delete" components and thus code)*.

Claim 8

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining whether the

data structure is associated with the source code comprises the step of searching a

comment in the source code for the identification of the data structure *(figure 2, note*

comments).

Claim 9

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining whether the

data structure is associated with the source code comprises the step of comparing a

name for the source code with the identification of the data structure *(figure 2, note*

comments).

Claim 10

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of: retrieving

access information for the database; and retrieving a portion of the data structure from

the database using the access information *(figure 1, element 100 and 130)*.

Claim 11

Walton disclosed the method of claim 10, wherein the step of retrieving the access

information comprises the step of retrieving the identification of the data structure and

the access information from a configuration file *(figure 1, element 100 and 130)*.

Claim 12

Walton disclosed the method of claim 10, wherein the step of retrieving the access

information comprises the step of retrieving the identification of the data structure and

the access information from a comment of the source code *(figure 1, "include"*

statement also performs a commenting function).

Claim 13

Walton disclosed the method of claim 10, wherein the portion of the data structure

comprises the attribute field of the data structure *(figure 1, elements 100 and 110,*

selecting and manipulating components).

Claim 14

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the source code comprises a class

(column 8, lines 54-56).

Claim 15

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the source code comprises a

distributed computing component *(column 8, lines 54-56; distributed as far as from a*

database).

Claim 17

Walton disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the step of generating the new

attribute in the source code comprises the step of generating a method in the source

code to access the attribute field of the data structure *(column 8, lines 54-56 "connected*

to other objects").

Claims 18-28, 31-32, 34-65, 68-76, 78-89, 92-93 and 95-136

The limitations of claims 18-28, 31-32, 34-65, 68-76, 78-89, 92-93 and 95-136

correspond to the limitations found in method claims 1-4 and 7-17 and are rejected in

the same manner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16, 33, 77 and 94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Walton** et al. (USPN 5,883,639) in view of **Chainini** et al. (USPN 5,760,788) in

view of **Hedin** ("Supporting Programming Conventions") in view of Official Notice.

Claims 16, 33, 77 and 94

Walton discloses the method of claim 15, but does not explicitly disclose the distributed

computing component is an Enterprise JavaBean.TM.

Official Notice is taken that it was known at the time of invention to make use of

JavaBean components.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

implement the components of **Walton** with including Enterprise JavaBean components.

This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art

would be motivated to make use of all components on the market in-order to reach the

largest available clientele.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jason Mitchell whose telephone number is (571)272-

3728. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate

Fridays 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bullock Lewis can be reached on (571) 272-3759. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Mitchell/
Examiner, Art Unit 2193

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193